

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed January 17, 2006 has been carefully considered.  
Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Subject Matter Indicated Allowed or Allowable**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowance of claims 5-14 and 47-56.  
Applicants are further grateful for the indication of allowability of claims 17-24, 29, 30, 41, 42  
and 59-66.

**Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4, 15, 16, 25-28, 31-40, 43-46, 57 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §  
102(e) as anticipated by Katzenberg et al. (U.S. pat. no. 6,218,930).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, first and second steering circuits, and “first and second electrical signal together constituting a loop back of [a] different mode signal.” Katzenberg does not disclose first and second steering circuits, or loop back of a differential mode signal. Katzenberg merely discloses a mechanism for determining if a remote device is able to support remote power feed. The consequences of this remote power feed, and, more importantly, its use to inactivate loop back in order to avoid potential computer network problems as explained in for example page 3, lines 18-21 of the specification, are addressed in Katzenberg. Conventionally, loop back was inactivated by using unreliable expensive and bulky equipment such as mechanical relays 62 and 70, and low pass filters 68, illustrated in prior art FIG. 1 and explained in the background section of the specification. The present invention, on the other hand, avoids these undesirable components by providing the loop back in the manner claimed, the loop back being active in the absence of local power up, but being deactivated in its presence.

It will be appreciated that, according to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if each and every claim element is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.<sup>1</sup> The aforementioned reasons clearly indicate the contrary, and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection based on Katzenberg is respectfully urged.

Claim 2 recites similar features absent from Katzenberg, including the first and second steering circuits, and “circuitry response to application of a DC voltage level disabling [a] first steering circuit.” The same reasoning applies to this feature. Claim 4 recites, in addition to the steering circuits, “circuitry responsive to application of a DC voltage level distorting the differential mode signal prior to transmitting it on the second pair of conductors.” These features are not disclosed in Katzenberg and claim 4 is allowable for at least this reason. Claims 15 and 16 recite the steering circuits and, *inter alia*, a current mirror, a voltage storage device coupled to the current mirror, and a switch controlled thereby. These features are not disclosed in Katzenberg. Claim 25 is a method claim reciting features similar to those of claim 1 (and 31) and is allowable at least for that reason. Claim 26 is a method claim reciting first and second steering circuits which are not disclosed in Katzenberg. Claim 27 further adds “disabling at least one of said first steering circuit and said second steering circuit in response to receipt of said power,” a feature absent from Katzenberg. Claim 28 further distorting at least one of said first signal and second signal in response to receipt of said power signal,” also a feature absent from Katzenberg.

Claim 31-40 are means-plus-function type claims reciting features similar to those addressed above and are allowable at least for the same reasons. Claims 43-46, 57 and 58 are system claims also containing similar features, and are allowable for the same reasons.

---

<sup>1</sup> Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

**Conclusion**


In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,  
THELEN REID & PRIEST, L.L.P.

Dated: April 17, 2006

  
Khaled Shami  
Reg. No. 38,745

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 282-1855  
Fax. (408) 287-8040